

# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

## 2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

**FOR:**

### Tools of Empowerment

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Unsatisfactory	Lesson matches original description	(Below Standard) 1	Criminal Background Checks	Non-Compliance
Recruiting Materials	Unsatisfactory	Instruction is clear	(Below Standard) 1	Health/safety laws & regulations	Compliance
Academic Program	Unsatisfactory	Time on task is appropriate	(Below Standard) 1	Financial viability	Compliance
Progress Reporting	Satisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	(Below/Approaching Standard) 1.5		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Unsatisfactory	Student/instructor ratio: 1:1 to 8:1	3 (meeting standard)		

### ACTION NEEDED:

*As of the 2008-2009 school year, Tools of Empowerment will no longer be providing SES programs to Indiana students.*

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Tools of Empowerment  
**REVIEWER:** MC

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** 1/4/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	<p><b>BOTH</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Tutor resumes/applications (<u>all tutors</u>)</li> <li>-Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.)</li> </ul> <p><i>In addition to:</i></p> <p><b>ONE</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Tutor evaluations (<u>all tutors</u>)</li> <li>-Recruiting policy for tutors (<u>one copy</u>)</li> <li>-Sample tutor contract (<u>one copy</u>)</li> </ul>	<p>Tutor applications</p> <p>Documentation of prof. development</p> <p>Tutor agreement</p>	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional development workshop topic was problem-solving. However, the document was not an agenda, sign-in sheet, etc.; therefore, it is impossible to tell if the training was actually conducted; with which tutors it was conducted, and when it was conducted.</li> <li>Tutor agreement has a variety of requirements for tutors, including requirement to engage students in meaningful learning in accordance with Individual Learning Plan. However, as indicated in the observation component (in this report), it appears that a number of tutors have not met this requirement.</li> <li>Provider application indicates that all tutors will be certified. However, employment applications submitted do not ask whether applicant is certified; they only ask about relevant work experience and whether the person holds a bachelor's degree, beyond a bachelor's degree, or less than a bachelor's. Based on the applications submitted, while a few tutors appear to be certified teachers, many tutors are not certified teachers, which does not match the provider's application. Some applicants appear to have no educational experience at all.</li> </ul>

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Recruiting materials	<b>TWO</b> of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	Program description for parents Incentive description	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description describes services as small group; however, by IDOE Policies &amp; Procedures definition, Tools instruction is large group (8:1). Description describes “academic coaches”, which are not described in original application (assume they are tutors). Description states that academic coaches are experienced; however, given tutor applications described above, some tutors (academic coaches) do not have educational experience.</li> <li>Incentive offered is in compliance with current IDOE incentive policy.</li> </ul>
Academic Program	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	Lesson plans (plans included connections to standards)	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slightly less than half of the lesson plans submitted matched provider’s description in application and appeared appropriate, while the other half were not.</li> <li>Some described students primarily working on workbooks. Some of the activities described did not connect with lesson objectives. Some strategies do not appear appropriate or appear unclear to attain lesson objectives (i.e., “sharing stories to increase reading comprehension”). In some cases, strategies are weak or unclear (i.e., strategy of “work on workbooks and use manipulatives”). In other cases, strategies do not appear to be teaching strategies but instead, tutors appear to simply have listed the materials that they will use in the lesson (which should have been listed in the “materials” section). Sometimes, strategies address subjects that were not described in lesson objectives.</li> <li>Some lesson plans did not appear to be age appropriate (i.e., having kindergarten students work on workbooks for the entire lesson; having first grade students work primarily independently for the entire</li> </ul>

					<p>lesson).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lesson plans were often for multiple days; it was unclear which lesson or objective was for which day, or whether all topics would be covered on all days. Lesson plans should be separated, with one lesson plan for one lesson, not for multiple lessons.</li> <li>Some lesson plans, even if for multiple days, appeared to cover too much ground.</li> <li>Lesson plans submitted were not similar to lessons provided during on-site visits (on-site lesson plans, when provided, were generally much vaguer than lesson plans submitted for document analysis).</li> </ul>
COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Progress Reporting	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Progress reports (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports)</li> <li>-Timeline for sending progress reports</li> <li>-Documentation of reports sent</li> </ul>			X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reports are parent-friendly and include a description of skills covered, scores for those skills, and comments. Reports also include scores for attitude, attendance, and effort.</li> <li>Progress reports are submitted monthly, which matches the timeline provided in SES agreements and contracts.</li> </ul>
Assessment and Individual Program Design	<p><b>ALL</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student</li> <li>- Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out)</li> <li>-Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.</li> </ul>		X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description submitted on assessment's connection to academic standards is vague and does not provide a clear understanding of how the assessment connects, especially in the area of Reading.</li> <li>No description of the process used to develop individual learning plans was provided.</li> <li>Individual learning plans submitted were somewhat vague. Moreover, they did not include specific strategies and/or lessons that would help the student achieve the goals. The goals basically just reiterated</li> </ul>

					the weaknesses and were rarely measurable (i.e., how is “will be able to” measured? How is “will continue to improve” measured?)
--	--	--	--	--	--

## On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER: Tools of Empowerment**

**DATE:** 12/06/07, 12/13/07, 12/18/07

**SITE:** Harrison Hill Elementary (MSDLT); Garfield Elementary (Muncie Com. Schs.); Riverside Elem. #44 (IPS); Thomas Gregg Elementary #15 (IPS); T.C. Steele Elementary #98 (IPS); John Marshall Middle School (IPS); William A. Bell Elementary #60 (IPS); Forest Manor Middle School (IPS)

**REVIEWERS:** M.C., S.T., S.F., C.E., K.S.

**TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED):**

**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:50PM; 4:00PM; 3:30PM; 4:05PM; 4:05PM; 4:15PM; 3:30PM; 4:10PM

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 24**

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	<b>X</b>				Very few lessons observed were similar to the application description. The application states that manipulatives will be used, as well as that instructional strategies will be used to introduce and reinforce concepts. However, in many of the lessons observed across sites, children merely worked on workbook pages for an extended period of time and asked tutors questions when needed. Little to no actual instruction was observed in these lessons. In these sessions, students worked independently, often having trouble staying on task. In sessions in which students were working with a tutor providing some direct instruction to the group, it often appeared that tutors were not following lesson plans but instead were making up the lesson as they went. Lesson plans for each lesson being observed were usually not available; lesson plans, when produced, were usually for lessons that had taken place several days or weeks earlier. In addition, lesson plans appeared to have been developed for the large group of students and did not have any individualized components; therefore, lesson plans did not appear to be tailored to recognizing individual student needs. In some lessons observed, tutors appeared unsure what to do next; as a result, they made up what appeared to be random activities for students or asked students to work on workbook pages that appeared to be selected randomly from the workbook. Lessons rarely appeared to be age or level appropriate nor did they appear to have clear objectives. There were only three lessons observed (out of

				<p>18 total) in which a lesson was being provided where teachers appeared to have clear objectives, introduced concepts, and used manipulatives and instructional strategies. The general lack of organization of most lessons also led to a general lack of student engagement and difficulty with behavior management.</p> <p>During the second round of visits, at one site, students worked in small groups. In one of the groups, the tutor worked with the students on math problems using manipulatives. The students practiced addition using popsicle sticks. In the other group, students worked independently with very little tutor interaction at all. In the entire time the group was observed (about 20 minutes), the tutor spoke to the students just a few times. At one point, the tutor picked up a broom and began sweeping the floor while the students continued to work independently. Due to lack of tutor direction, the students struggled to stay on task and often disrupted one another. At another site, a tutor worked independently with a student on reading comprehension questions. While the student seemed engaged, the tutor did not use a wide variety of instructional strategies to reinforce concepts. The tutor did not appear to have a lesson plan; although curriculum materials were used, after finishing the reading comprehension activity the tutor simply asked the student what she would like to work on, and then they turned to that page in the workbook. At a third site, a tutor worked with a small group of students. Two of the students were working on telling time; the tutor worked with them using worksheets. At times, the tutor struggled to help the students understand. Few instructional strategies (other than repeating what had already been said) were observed. The third student worked independently for periods of up to 20-25 minutes with no tutor interaction at all. Even when the tutor began to work with that student, the tutor was often disrupted by the other students asking questions or having finished their given problem and asking for another problem. When asked for a lesson plan, the tutor noted that she had forgotten to bring it with her. At a fourth site, students worked in two groups. In one group, the tutor utilized multiple instructional strategies while working independently with a variety of students on worksheets. Although the students were using worksheets, the tutor utilized manipulatives and instructional methods to reinforce broader concepts. In the other group, the tutor worked with students on reading and circling words in a workbook page. It was unclear what the broader purpose of reading the words was (i.e., were students learning blends? compound words? vowel sounds?), as the tutor did not introduce a lesson objective, nor did the tutor tie reading the words into larger concepts. Instead, students simply took turns reading selected words on workbook pages. At times, the tutor asked the students to point to what seemed to be random words on the page. Because the tutor did not tie the activity into a larger concept or introduce the objective of the lesson (or help the students understand why they were reading the particular words they were reading), it appeared that the workbook page had simply been picked at random. Additionally, although the tutoring schedule indicated that tutoring would begin at 4:00, students were still finishing their snacks and talking to one another up until 4:25 (despite the fact that the other group in the same room had been working the whole time, since 4:00). At another site, although the tutoring schedule submitted indicated that tutoring would begin at 2:30 and last until 4:30, students were observed unsupervised at</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					4:15 and indicated that their tutor had left at 4:00 and that tutoring had ended then. For liability purposes, this is unacceptable. This situation was brought to the attention of the district.
Instruction is clear					<p>In most cases, students did not appear to understand what was expected of them, nor did they appear to understand the objectives of the lessons being provided. Only in rare cases did tutors appear to be utilizing any type of individual student plans or initial student assessments; even in those cases, it was not always clear that what was being taught was appropriate for the individual needs of students. In some cases, tutors did not seem to have a lesson plan at all, but instead seemed to make up the lesson as they went along. Individualized instruction was not observed, except for a few cases in which students were working individually on workbook pages. Even in those cases, tutors did not provide much instruction and instead just answered questions that students might have as they worked. Sometimes it was difficult to determine which tutor was working with which group of students, which also seemed to confuse students at times. Adjusted instruction and scaffolding was not observed; tutors generally utilized the same methods of instruction for each student and often had difficulty helping students who were struggling.</p> <p>During the second round of visits, in one lesson, the instruction was very clear and a variety of instructional methods were utilized to ensure that students grasped concepts from the worksheets that they were working on. In other lessons, it was not always clear that students (or tutors) understood what the overall lesson objective was, nor was it clear that individual worksheets selected were part of a larger lesson plan or were geared toward student learning gaps. In one lesson, while the tutor engaged the student in working on a reading comprehension activity, many times the student already had the correct answer (and had already shared it aloud) but the tutor still read through each question aloud and then read through the correct answer aloud (which the student had already selected). The tutor persisted in this format despite quick responses from the student. In rare cases when the student did not have the correct answer, the tutor did not seem to engage the student in a discussion about why another answer was correct; instead, the tutor gave the student the correct answer and asked if the student agreed. The tutor offered little direction, skill development, or clarification beyond referring the student back to the reading selection. In another lesson, students worked independently on homework or worksheets the entire time observed, with no direction from the tutor other than to tell them to continue working. At another site, the tutor worked with students on telling time. Some of the tutor's attempts at helping the students understand telling time appeared to confuse them further; additionally, it appeared that the activity was too difficult for the students to accomplish. A third student worked independently with little to no tutor interaction. As noted above, at a fourth site (where students worked on circling words on a workbook page), it was not clear what the overall objective of circling the words was.</p>
	X				



Time on task is appropriate				<p>Students were rarely on task. In only a few lessons observed did students appear to be engaged in their tutoring lesson. In many cases, students ran around the room, had heads down, talked loudly with one another, fought verbally, crawled on the floor, or played with things in their backpacks. Some rooms were so noisy it was difficult to concentrate. Tutors often had difficulty managing behavior, especially in the larger groups. In sessions where students worked on workbooks individually, students often had difficulty concentrating or staying on task when the tutor was not there to work with them. Some tutors attempted to manage behavior inappropriately, by yelling at or loudly chastising students.</p> <p>During the second round of visits, in two lessons, students stayed on task and needed little to no redirection from the tutor. In other lessons, students sometimes got bored or off task and needed redirection. In the lesson where students had almost no tutor interaction and worked primarily independently on worksheets or homework, the students fought with one another and disrupted one another and were rarely on task. In another lesson, after a few minutes of trying to work on telling time, one student got up and wandered around the room, washed his hands, and began walking up and down the sides of the room looking at displays and books. After a while, the tutor finally asked the student to pick a book out of the book bin.</p> <p>At one site, although the tutoring schedule indicated that tutoring would begin at 4:00, students were still finishing their snacks and talking to one another up until 4:25 (despite the fact that the other group in the same room had been working the whole time, since 4:00). At another site, although the tutoring schedule submitted indicated that tutoring would begin at 2:30 and last until 4:30, students were observed unsupervised at 4:15 and indicated that their tutor had left at 4:00 and that tutoring had ended then. For liability purposes, this is unacceptable. The district was informed of this situation.</p>
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X			<p>Although a few instructors appeared familiar with the curriculum, student needs and learning styles, and their lesson plans, in general, it did not appear that tutors were knowledgeable of the Tools program. Few tutors utilized manipulatives or the Tools curriculum; some did not seem to operate from a lesson plan at all and their lessons seemed very disorganized. Tutors appeared unfamiliar with student needs and rarely demonstrated effective strategies or instructional techniques to meet student needs in the larger group settings. In some cases, tutors seemed to randomly select workbook pages or activities for students to complete without a larger plan or lesson objective. Tutors appeared to be unfamiliar with behavior management techniques and often seemed ill-equipped to deal with larger groups or to manage behavior even in the smaller group or independent working sessions.</p> <p>Most tutors did not have lesson plans available (for the lessons being observed) upon request. When lesson plans were provided, they were generally for lessons that had occurred several days or weeks prior to the visit. Where lesson plans could be reviewed, they did not always seem organized or age appropriate and were rarely individualized. In one case, when a lesson plan was requested, the tutor indicated that there had not been sufficient time to create the lesson plan for that particular lesson. At that point, the tutor</p>

					<p>left the students to work with the site director while the tutor (according to the site director) began writing up the lesson plan for that day. The site director seemed unsure of what to do with students while the tutor created the lesson plan.</p> <p>At one site, students were observed participating in an assessment. Although the students were supposed to be completing the assessment, many of them talked with one another or had difficulty paying attention to complete the assessment. Moreover, the facilitator assigned to work with the students being assessed was unable to keep students on task with the assessment. It also appeared in several cases that the facilitator was inappropriately coaching students to answers on the assessment. Actions of the facilitator may invalidate assessment results. A facilitator should provide nothing but instruction to students taking assessments; however, this facilitator did not appear to have been properly trained on administering assessments and ensuring students are on task while taking assessments.</p> <p>During the second round of visits, in one lesson, the instructor appeared very knowledgeable of students' skill gaps and worked with them to reinforce concepts. In another lesson, while the tutor appeared to have a good rapport with the student and appeared to know the material, few strategies or techniques were offered to help the student address questions that had been answered incorrectly or to tie answers to larger reading comprehension concepts. In another lesson, the tutor did not appear to interact with the students at all, nor did the tutor appear to know what the students were working on. One tutor did not appear to understand the levels of the students that were being worked with, as the tutor was working on concepts that appeared manageable for one of the students but too difficult for the other student. The tutor struggled to keep students on task while working independently with another student. Some tutors did not appear to have lesson plans or did not seem to know how to tie what they were working on to broader concepts or objectives.</p>
Student/instructor ratio: 1:1 to 8:1 Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X		<p>Ratios ranged from a low of 1:1 to a high of 8:1. Provider application amendment states that ratios will not exceed 8:1. Although observed ratios were in line with state approved ratios and the provider's application, in many cases (as is noted in this report), it appeared that tutors were not equipped to deal with larger groups of more than 4 or 5 students.</p>

## On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric COMPLIANCE Components

**NAME OF PROVIDER:** Tools of Empowerment  
**REVIEWER:** MC

**DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED:** 1/04/08

The following information is rated “Compliance” (C) or “Non-Compliance” (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider’s organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	<b>ALL</b> of the following:  -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	Criminal background checks submitted for every employee. <b>Two names were misspelled—appropriately spelled background checks were not submitted</b>		<b>X</b>
Health and safety laws and regulations	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Student release policy(ies)  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student release policy</li> <li>• Transportation policy</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>	
Financial viability	<b>ONE</b> of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage  <i>In addition to:</i> <b>ONE</b> of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of liability insurance</li> <li>• Audited financial statements</li> </ul>	<b>X</b>	